

REMARKS

The Office Action dated September 24, 2004 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 4 and 10 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-3 have been allowed, and claims 4-12 are respectfully submitted for consideration.

Claims 1-3 were indicated as being allowed in the Office Action. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for allowing these claims. Applicants also note that claims 4-12 were not rejected over prior art, and therefore Applicants assume that claims 4-12 would be in condition for allowance once all formal matters have been addressed.

In the Office Action, claims 4-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. The rejection is rendered moot for the following reasons.

The Office Action states that there is insufficient antecedent basis, in claim 4, for the limitation "said memory command bus" recited on line 5 therein. Claim 4 has been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 4 is rendered moot, and the claim is now in condition for allowance.

Claims 5-9 are dependent upon claim 4. Therefore, claims 5-9 should also be allowed for at least their dependence upon claim 4, and for the specific limitations recited therein.

The Office Action indicated that claim 10 refers to “a shared memory” (claim 10, line 4) and “a memory/command bus” (claim 10, line 6). The Office Action then alleges that it is unclear if the phrases “a shared memory” and “a memory/command bus” are the same elements as “a shared memory” recited on line 2 and “a shared memory/command bus” recited on lines 1-2, respectively. Claim 10 has been amended to more distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 10 is rendered moot, and that this claim is now in condition for allowance.

Applicants note that claims 11 and 12 are dependent upon claim 10. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 11 and 12 are also in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph has been addressed and is rendered moot. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that all of claims 1-12 are now in condition for allowance. It is therefore respectfully requested that claims 1-12 be allowed, and this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by

telephone, the applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



Majid S. AlBassam
Registration No. 54,749

Customer No. 32294
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700
Telephone: 703-720-7800
Fax: 703-720-7802

MSA:jf